

**AGENDA MEMO**

CITY COUNCIL MEETING DATE: MARCH 7, 2007

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

ITEM DESCRIPTION: GPA-18818 - APPLICANT/OWNER: CRAIG TENAYA, LLC

---

*THIS ITEM WAS HELD IN ABEYANCE FROM THE FEBRUARY 21, 2007 CITY COUNCIL MEETING AT THE REQUEST OF COUNCILMAN BROWN.*

**\*\* CONDITIONS \*\***

Staff recommends DENIAL. The Planning Commission (5-2/se, sd vote) recommends APPROVAL.

**\*\* STAFF REPORT \*\***

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

This is a request to amend a portion of the Centennial Hills Sector Plan of the Master Plan from O (Office) to H (High Density Residential) on 7.49 acres adjacent to the east side of Tenaya Way approximately 970 feet south of Craig Road.

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

<b><i>Related Relevant City Actions by P&amp;D, Fire, Bldg., etc.</i></b>	
09/05/90	The City Council denied a request for a reclassification of property (Z-0080-90) from N-U (Non-Urban) to C-1 (Limited Commercial) that included a shopping center, convenience store with gasoline sales, a four to six story office building, three off-premise billboard signs, an automobile service facility, restaurant with a beer/wine/cooler on-sale use, and retail stores with beer/wine/cooler off-sale uses. The Planning Commission recommended denial. Staff recommended approval.
11/06/96	The applicant withdrew without prejudice a request for a reclassification of property (Z-0094-96) from N-U (Non-Urban) to C-2 (General Commercial) for a 105,744 square-foot retail warehouse. The Planning Commission and staff recommended approval.
01/08/98	The applicant withdrew without prejudice a request for a Rezoning (Z-0081-97) from U (Undeveloped) [SC (Service Commercial) land use designation] to C-1 (Limited Commercial) for a 130,858 square-foot retail store. Staff recommended that the item be held in abeyance.
01/19/00	The City Council approved a Rezoning (Z-0071-99) of this site to O (Office), as part of a larger overall request which included the rezoning of the property to the north to C-1 (Limited Commercial). Staff recommended approval, and the Planning Commission believed the request to be premature and recommended denial.
01/25/07	<p>The Planning Commission recommended approval of companion items ZON-18819, VAR-18820, SUP-18821 and SDR-18822 concurrently with this application.</p> <p>The Planning Commission voted 5-2/se, sd to recommend APPROVAL (PC Agenda Item #39/ar).</p>
<b><i>Related Building Permits/Business Licenses</i></b>	
There are no permits or licenses related to this application.	
<b><i>Pre-Application Meeting</i></b>	
12/14/06	A pre-application meeting was held. The requirements of a General Plan Amendment were explained.

<b><i>Neighborhood Meeting</i></b>	
	A neighborhood meeting was held at Timbers Bar & Grill, 7081 West Craig Road at 6:15 P.M. Six members of the public attended and had the following concerns and comments:
	Five story condos too dense for area
	Concerns about impact to schools
	Support for two story office or commercial at site
	Concerns about fire
	Concerns about size and scope of project so close to single family homes
01/03/07	Concerns that the applicant did not properly notify the neighborhood meeting.

<b><i>Details of Application Request</i></b>	
<b><i>Site Area</i></b>	
Net Acres	7.49

<b>Surrounding Property</b>	<b>Existing Land Use</b>	<b>Planned Land Use</b>	<b>Existing Zoning</b>
Subject Property	Undeveloped	O (Office)	O (Office)
North	Shopping Center	SC (Service Commercial)	C-1 (Limited Commercial)
South	Singe-Family Residential	ML (Medium-Low Density Residential)	R-CL (Single-Family Compact-Lot)
	Multi-Family Residential	M (Medium Density Residential)	R-3 (Medium Density Residential)
East	Undeveloped	SC (Service Commercial)	C-1 (Limited Commercial)
West	Single Family Residential	ML (Medium-Low Density Residential)	R-PD8 (Residential Planned Development – 8 Units Per Acre)

<b><i>Special Districts/Zones</i></b>	<b><i>Yes</i></b>	<b><i>No</i></b>	<b><i>Compliance</i></b>
<b>Special Area Plan</b>		X	N/A
<b><i>Special Districts/Zones</i></b>	<b><i>Yes</i></b>	<b><i>No</i></b>	<b><i>Compliance</i></b>
<b>Special Purpose and Overlay Districts</b>			
A-O (Airport Overlay) District (175-Foot)	X		Y
<b>Trails</b>		X	N/A
<b>Rural Preservation Overlay District</b>		X	N/A
<b>Development Impact Notification Assessment</b>		X	N/A
<b>Project of Regional Significance</b>		X	N/A

## **ANALYSIS**

The request is for a General Plan Amendment from O (Office) to H (High Density Residential). The proposed designation allows development such as multi-family plexes, townhouses, high-density apartments and high rise. The 7.49 acre site is currently undeveloped. The amendment was submitted in conjunction with a proposed Rezoning (ZON-18819) to R-4 (High Density Residential), a Variance (VAR-18820) to allow a 72-foot high building where 35 feet is the maximum height allowed, a Special Use Permit (SUP-18821) for a mixed-use development, and a Site Development Plan Review (SDR-18822) for a proposed five-story mixed-use development consisting of 213 condominium units and 29,717 square feet of commercial space.

Because the development plan associated with this request does not comply with the height requirements of Title 19, and because the density allowed by the proposed H (High Density Residential) designation is not compatible with the existing single family residential development to the south of this site, staff is unable to support this General Plan Amendment.

## **FINDINGS**

Section 19.18.030.I of the Las Vegas Zoning Code requires that the following conditions be met in order to justify a General Plan Amendment:

1. The density and intensity of the proposed General Plan Amendment is compatible with the existing adjacent land use designations,
2. The zoning designations allowed by the proposed amendment will be compatible with the existing adjacent land uses or zoning districts,
3. There are adequate transportation, recreation, utility, and other facilities to accommodate the uses and densities permitted by the proposed General Plan Amendment; and
4. The proposed amendment conforms to other applicable adopted plans and policies that include approved neighborhood plans.

### **In regard to “1”:**

The proposed H (High Density Residential) allows development such as multi-family plexes, townhouses, high-density apartments and high rise at densities exceeding 25.5 units per acres. This type of density is not compatible with the existing ML (Medium-Low Density Residential) development to the south.

**In regard to “2”:**

If approved, this amendment would allow development within the standards of the R-4 (High Density Residential) District. The R-4 (High Density Residential) District is intended to provide for the development of a variety of multi-family units such as duplexes, townhouses and high density apartments which are not compatible with the existing R-CL (Single Family Compact-Lot) development to the south.

**In regard to “3”:**

There are adequate facilities and infrastructure to accommodate a planned community on this site.

**In regard to “4”:**

This request does not comply with Program B1.4 of the Centennial Hills Sector Plan, which encourages the development of random vacant infill lots in substantially developed, single-family neighborhoods at densities similar to existing development.

This request also does not comply with Policy B3 of the Centennial Hills Sector Plan, which states that the appropriate location of multiple family residential uses in the Northwest area of the city should be in the Centennial Hills Town Center or Village Center areas.

The necessity of the associated height variance (VAR-18820) indicates that this General Plan Amendment is not in compliance with Program B3.1 of the Centennial Hills Sector Plan, which requires multi-family developments to be compatible with adjoining single-family uses through site planning and building design, setback and height requirements, landscape and wall buffers, and other buffers to adjoining uses.

**PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION**

There were speakers in protest at the Planning Commission meeting.

**NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATIONS NOTIFIED**

7

**ASSEMBLY DISTRICT** 34

**SENATE DISTRICT** 4

**NOTICES MAILED** 655 by Planning Department

**APPROVALS** 1

**PROTESTS** 4